Sacramento River Hydroligic Region Comments.

Brett Matzke [bmatzkewepa@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2013 6:59 PM
To: DWR CWP Comments

Although we see why some of the publics are concerned because the Sacramento Region uses Fish as there "Canary in the Coal Mine,' We feel that the fish are a good indicator of the health of the system.   In saying this we also believe that a lot of the basic arguments over what to do are directly related to Water Rights and how superior they are. You did forget to mention Aboriginal Rights. Please see the comments below.

1 ➢ SR-10, line 37, Thus causing problems for distribution of potable water to all communities.
2 ➢ SR -14, Line 37, need to add Tribes to the mix.
3 ➢ SR-18, line 36, need to insert additional paragraph talking about Tribes that have "Treatment as a State" (TAS) under the Clean water act by EPA. This is given a Sovereign nation like a tribe by EPA to be able to develop their own Water Quality Standards and Beneficial uses that can include Cultural and Groundwater standards. Contact Wendell Smith at US EPA in SF. You also should include a section here on Aboriginal Rights taking president over much more junior rights.
4 ➢ SR-22, line 6, many foothill areas do not contain adequate Water Quality or Water Quantity to insure potable water or sanitary facilities for all communities.
5 ➢ SR-30, line 32, Again it needs to be mentioned that after decades of fights and plans solidifying the demands on the Trinity's water (like mentioned on SR-27 @35) the Trinity should be off limits to changes in its flows as a source of additional water for valley agriculture.
6 ➢ SR-37, line 36, need to add BDCP.
7 ➢ SR-59, line 19, Add Tribal Water Quality Standards and Designation of Beneficial Uses.
8 ➢ SR-62, line 25,   add Tribes.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Brett Matzke

R. Brett Matzke
Executive Director, WEPA
Wintun Environmental Protection Agency
570 6th St.
PO Box   1630
Williams, CA 95987-1630
530-473-3318 office
559-760-3045 cell
bmatzkewepa@gmail.com